DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 455 002 PS 029 639

TITLE	Collaborative Partners: California's Experience with the 1997 Head Start Expansion Grants.
INSTITUTION	California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento. Head Start-State Collaboration Office.
SPONS AGENCY	Administration for Children and Families (DHHS), Washington, DC.
ISBN	ISBN-0-8011-1491-8
PUB DATE	2000-00-00
NOTE	55p.
AVAILABLE FROM	California State Department of Education, CDE Press, Sales Office, P.O. Box 271, Sacramento, CA 95812-0271 ($12.50, plus shipping). Fax: 916-323-0823.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Cooperative Programs; Coordination; Eligibility; Federal Aid; Federal Programs; Incentive Grants; *Partnerships in Education; Preschool Education; Program Descriptions; *Program Implementation
IDENTIFIERS	Barriers to Implementation; California; *Program Expansion; *Project Head Start

ABSTRACT

This study surveyed Head Start grantees in California who had received federal funds to expand their programs through partnerships with local and state organizations or blended funding. The survey sought to provide a profile of the collaborative partnerships formed and identify best practices, program barriers and solutions, and unresolved issues. In addition to program demographics, findings included the following: (1) the most frequently noted strategy to establish partnerships was meeting with prospective partners early in the process and frequently. Also mentioned were setting common goals, being under the same umbrella organization, flexibility, and joint training; (2) local planning councils and resource and referral agencies were the resources most relied on for support; and (3) the single most pervasive barrier mentioned was the difference in state and federal income eligibility for families. Other barriers included differences in program cultures, differences in operating hours or days, differing fiscal requirements, the requirement that parents be given a choice of programs, and an inadequate number of facilities. (Includes a section describing state and federal activities affecting partnerships. Appendices contain summaries of the responses from each program and the survey.) (EV)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 455 002

Collaborative Partners

California's Experience with the 1997 Head Start Expansion Grants

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Michael Silver
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

ES 029639

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Sacramento, 1999

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Collaborative Partners

California's Experience with the 1997 Head Start Expansion Grants

CALIFORNIA HEAD START–STATE COLLABORATION OFFICE
Child Development Division
California Department of Education

Publishing Information

Collaborative Partners: California's Experience with the 1997 Head Start Expansion Grants was developed by the California Head Start–State Collaboration Office, Child Development Division, California Department of Education, and was published by the Department, 721 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, California (mailing address: P.O. Box 944272, Sacramento, CA 94244-2720). It was distributed under the provisions of the Library Distribution Act and *Government Code* Section 11096.

© 2000 by the California Department of Education
All rights reserved

ISBN 0-8011-1491-8

Ordering Information

Copies of this publication are available for $12.50 each, plus shipping and handling charges. California residents are charged sales tax. Orders may be sent to California Department of Education, CDE Press, Sales Office, P.O. Box 271, Sacramento, CA 95812-0271; FAX (916) 323-0823.

An illustrated *Educational Resources Catalog* describing publications, videos, and other instructional media available from the Department can be obtained without charge by writing to the address given above or by calling the Sales Office at (916) 445-1260.

Prepared for publication by CSEA members.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Contents

Page

Acknowledgments v

Introduction 1

Summary of the Surveys 5

State and Federal Activities Affecting Partnerships 11

Appendixes

A. The Surveys: Information from the Survey Respondents 13

B. California Head Start and Collaborative Partnerships Survey 45

Acknowledgments

The California Head Start–State Collaboration Office of the California Department of Education, Child Development Division, developed this report. The United States Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, and the California Department of Education provided funds for the production of the report.

California Head Start–State Collaboration Office (CHSSCO)
Michael Silver, Director
Michael Zito, Coordinator
California Department of Education
Child Development Division
560 J Street, Suite 220
Sacramento, CA 95814
Telephone (916) 322-6233

Thanks are due to Norma Johnson, Tony Colon, Dolores Meade, and Deborah Paratore for their review of the draft report and to Nina Ures for her assistance in transcribing the surveys.

Introduction

This report had its genesis in President Clinton's signing of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, which fundamentally changed the nation's approach to welfare. The Act eliminated the Aid to Families with Dependent Children entitlement programs and instead provided to states block grants with strict time limits and work participation requirements. It soon became evident that the way child care and development services were provided to families on welfare would also need to change.

In March of 1997, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families (ACF), released an invitation to Head Start grantees across the country to apply for funds to expand enrollment. Special priority and a competitive advantage were given to applicants who proposed to create full-day/full-year Head Start services through blended funding and/or other partnerships. Grantees were urged to combine expansion funds with other child care and early childhood funding sources and deliver services through partnerships with (1) community-based child care centers and providers; and (2) state and local funding sources. Further, the ACF requirements stated that federal funds could not be used to extend the length of the Head Start program day; rather, funds had to be used to serve additional children. Another expansion funding announcement in March 1999 continued to give a competitive advantage to applicants who proposed to start or expand full-day/full-year services to new families.

Creating partnerships to provide high-quality full-day/full-year child care and development services is not easy. Each program has its own set of funding requirements and acronyms, and differing views of the mission and primary focus of each partner's program create misunderstandings. The federal expansion grant announcement

was released without any coordination with state governments, which administer many funds to local child care providers that Head Start programs would approach as potential partners. Regulatory and other conflicts were not resolved prior to the release of the federal funds.

In response to these challenges, California grantees applying for the 1997 expansion funds requested technical assistance from ACF and the California Department of Education's Child Development Division (CDD), which is responsible for California's state-funded system of child care and development programs. In November of 1997, the Region IX office of the ACF held a roundtable discussion of partnership issues for programs that were considering applying for the expansion grants. In April of 1998, a second roundtable, which focused on a description of California's system of state-funded child care and development programs, was held. It was sponsored by the California Head Start Association, CDD, and the California Head Start–State Collaboration Office (CHSSCO). A third roundtable, held in July of 1999, focused on fiscal models.

The roundtables assisted Head Start grantees, CDD, and ACF in identifying and beginning to address a number of barriers and challenges the expansion programs would face. One of the agreements made at the second roundtable was that CHSSCO would survey the grantees to:

- Provide a profile of the collaboration partnerships formed.
- Identify best practices.
- Identify program barriers and solutions.
- Identify unresolved issues.

This report, written by CHSSCO staff with assistance and feedback from CDD staff, CHSA staff, and several local Head Start/CDD program providers, summarizes the responses to the surveys. A compilation of current federal, state, and local activities regarding collaborative partnership activities is also provided.

The following is a brief description of the primary partners or other members of California's child care and development services and support system:

Alternative Payment (AP). AP programs offer an array of child care arrangements for parents that include in-home care, family child care, and center care. This service most often takes the form of a voucher or certificate used for payment to parents or local child care providers. These services are available in all 58 counties in California.

Family child care homes (FCCH). Care is provided for children in a family setting. Small FCCHs may serve up to 8 children; large FCCHs may serve as many as 14 children.

General Child Care (GCC). This term is used to describe programs that utilize centers and networks of family child care homes, operated by either a public or private agency, to provide child care and development services for infants and children through age fourteen for state programs and through age thirteen for federal programs. These facilities provide basic supervision, age- and developmentally appropriate activities, nutrition, parent education, staff development, and social services.

Head Start (HS). These programs utilize center and in-home services operated by grantees or their delegate agencies that contract directly with the federal Administration for Children and Families to provide educational, health, medical, dental, nutritional, and mental health services to infants, toddlers, and preschool-age children. Head Start is the payor of last resort for many of these services if no other provider can be identified. Head Start also has strong parent involvement, parent governance, and social services components and funds programs for migrant and American Indian families separately.

Migrant child care. These programs serve children of migrant workers while their parents are at work. The centers are open for varying lengths of time during the year, depending on the harvesting activities in the area.

Resource and referral (R&R). R&R programs provide information to all parents and the community about the availability of child care, assist potential providers in the licensing process, provide direct services (including training), and coordinate community resources.

State Preschool. State preschools are usually a part-day, comprehensive developmental program for three- to five-year-old children from low-income families. The program emphasizes parent education and encourages parent involvement. In addition to basic preschool education activities, components include health, nutrition, social services, and staff development. These programs are administered through school districts, colleges, community action agencies, and private nonprofit agencies.

Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF). The TANF program was created by the Welfare Reform Law of 1996. Overseen by the Office of Family Assistance of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, the program provides assistance and work opportunities to needy families.

> *"One of the most exciting initiatives currently underway is partnerships between Head Start and child care. We dream for early childhood—to provide high-quality, comprehensive, full-day services to meet the needs of children and their parents. . . . "*
>
> *—Helen Taylor*
> *Associate Commissioner, Head Start Bureau*

"Collaboration is the process by which agencies formally commit themselves on a long-term basis to work together to accomplish a common mission. Collaboration brings previously separate organizations into a new working structure that requires joint planning, implementation, and evaluation. This partnership necessitates a sharing of resources, power, and authority. It also requires organizations to blend their strengths as well as negotiate their differences with an underlying attitude of trust. The goal of this partnership is comprehensive services for families that improve family outcomes."

—Texas Head Start–State Collaboration Project

Summary of the Surveys

The survey was developed by CHSSCO with input from the California Head Start Association (CHSA). The survey (see Appendix B) was mailed in July 1998 to the 32 grantees who were awarded expansion funds, with a response requested by September 15, 1998. Grantees who had not responded by the end of September received telephone reminders and a letter from the president of CHSA urging their response. The following 17 grantees returned completed surveys and are represented in this report:

- Contra Costa County Head Start
- County of San Joaquin Head Start Child Development Council, Inc.
- El Dorado County Office of Education
- Los Angeles County Office of Education
- Merced County Community Action Agency
- Monterey County Superintendent of Schools
- Napa-Solano Head Start
- Neighborhood House Association (San Diego)
- North Coast Children's Services (Ukiah)
- Placer Community Action, Inc.
- San Juan Unified School District Head Start
- Santa Clara County Office of Education
- Santa Cruz Community Counseling Center
- Sacramento Employment and Training Agency Head Start
- Shasta Head Start Child Development, Inc.
- Sonoma County People for Economic Opportunity Head Start
- Tulare County Office of Education

The surveys requested demographic data on the service area; information on new staff hires and the number of children served by the expansion; and answers to a variety of questions regarding the programs' successes and challenges in developing partnerships. Budget/funding-source data were also requested.

Caveats

Several caveats about the data should be noted:

- During the time the surveys were filled out (July–December 1998), a few of the partnerships were still in the planning phases; therefore, the services currently being provided may differ markedly from those described in the survey. One respondent noted on her survey, "We haven't begun to provide services yet—call me in a year! I'm sure other issues will surface!"
- There may have been some confusion about the funding-source data that were requested because the information submitted by the respondents differed widely.
- There were no agreed-upon categories or definitions for the various types of partnership models respondents reported; therefore, what one respondent describes as a "wraparound" program may be very different from another wraparound program.

Data Summary

1. **Partnership types. Respondents were asked who their partners were, how many children would be served in the expansion, and whether their full-day program was to be offered year-round (12 months) or for a shorter period (10 months). They were also asked to describe the services they provided and identify their funding sources.**

Head Start program respondents reported forming partnerships to serve an additional 4,177 children with the following numbers and types of agencies:

- Twelve state general child care programs
- Eleven state preschool programs
- Six alternative payment provider programs
- Four family child care home providers
- Five other partnerships, which include a partnership with providers for the Child Care Food Program and YWCA child care and city redevelopment funding (for facility renovation); another with Even Start (providing ESL, parenting classes, and mental health services); another that shares sites with JTPA, EDD, and CalWORKs; and a fourth that partners with the Day Care Providers Association. One Head Start agency provides comprehensive services to the children served by a variety of partners, including child care centers, homes, preschools, and exempt providers.

Children are being served at 91 expansion sites that offer a 12-month-per-year schedule. Seven sites offer a 10-month-per-year schedule.

2. **Successful strategies. Respondents were asked to identify strategies that they had used to establish collaborative partnerships and overcome existing barriers.**

The most frequently noted strategy to establish partnerships was *meeting with prospective partners early on in the process and frequently.* Respondents noted that this practice was crucial for relationship building, trust building, and developing the rapport needed for joint problem resolution. Several respondents reported the local planning council to be the best forum for these discussions.

The second most frequently mentioned strategy was to *set common goals, objectives, and a mission for the collaborative.* One respondent said, "A partnership must have a purpose to be established." Although such a statement seems self-evident, it appeared that not all of the partners shared the Head Start programs' sense of urgency for joining together. One respondent noted that all partners must have something to gain from the partnership. Another said it was important to show that a partnership can better utilize resources, thereby saving money over the long run. Another said that discussions about mission statements or goal development ultimately led to the development of highly detailed

interagency agreements or memorandums of understanding "that clearly state roles, expectations, responsibilities, financial commitments, and liability."

Several programs mentioned that it was *helpful when both Head Start and the other partner(s) were under the same umbrella organization.* One reported: "Our collaboration was facilitated by the fact that we are the state contractors for General Child Care. Any barriers were internal and have been resolved through successful collaborations from the past." In the majority of communities, however, partners were drawn from other, separate agencies.

Flexibility was also noted by several respondents as a necessity on both the program and fiscal sides. An example of the latter kind of flexibility was noted by one respondent who observed: "Since income eligibility criteria were different, Head Start had to obligate some of its 'over-income' slots to meet the state-funded income eligibility."

Joint trainings were also mentioned as being very useful for both staff and parents, as was the necessity of securing buy-ins for the collaborative from *management, boards of directors, line staff, and parents.* The need for these approvals was seconded by another respondent who also recommended setting regular times for staff and administrators to meet to " . . . review progress, share information, and resolve issues." Another respondent noted that "partners must be persistent, optimistic, and have a commitment to collaboration and working through barriers."

3. Sources of support. Respondents were asked to identify the resources they utilized in their collaborative efforts.

Respondents listed their *local planning council and resource and referral agencies* most often as the primary sources of support. For example, one respondent noted, " . . . the local planning council has been a great linkage for Head Start to bridge relationships. Many of our partnerships were first forged from discussions at council meetings and knowledge and trust built from those experiences." Another wrote, "Our resource and referral, as well as local welfare agencies, provided us with the pertinent statistical data to support our request for additional funding."

Several respondents thought that Region IX staff had been particularly supportive. One stated that Region IX staff " . . . said 'go for it,' even though there are no guidelines." Others felt that their local social services staff or community care licensing were supportive. Several others mentioned their own in-house staff, and several mentioned the staff from their partner agencies. One mentioned "the willingness on the part of State Preschool agencies to be open to designing this project and making it work" at the community level. Finally, one respondent recommended forging "strong links with [the] Board of Supervisors, City Council, and other elected officials."

4. Barriers and policy issues. Programs were asked to identify the issues and barriers they experienced while creating collaborative partnerships and to explain other broad policy issues that were addressed.

The single most pervasive barrier mentioned in the surveys was the *difference in state (CDD) and federal (Head Start) income eligibility* for families. Several respondents stated the belief that the Head Start ceilings are too low; one noted the ceilings " . . . exclude many families who are welfare-linked, but slightly over income (have a job and aren't receiving aid, but are still vulnerable to job loss) and who may be eligible by state standards."

Several respondents mentioned that their chief strategy to deal with state-federal requirement differences was to adopt the most stringent requirement in each area where there was a conflict—income eligibility, staffing ratios, or educational requirements.

Cultural differences between programs also needed to be bridged. Head Start, founded in the mid-sixties as part of the "war on poverty," has been funded primarily to provide developmental preschool, health, nutritional, and parent involvement/support services. Federal child care subsidies were developed primarily as a support service to low-income parents, making it possible

for them to work or participate in job training. In California, the educational and developmental component of child care has been substantially enhanced, but there are still differences. One respondent noted "we are working toward a conceptual shift from Head Start and CDD being two separate programs with two different sets of rules towards recognizing that there are many overarching similarities between the programs. We are working towards hearing fewer comments such as 'well that's not how we do it in CDD/Head Start.'" Another noted her community was "beginning to bridge the gap regarding perceptions and misinformation between State Preschool and Head Start staff."

Several respondents also listed differing hours, days, and even months of operation between partners as a barrier. One reported a difficult adjustment for a State Preschool program changing from a nine-month to a twelve-month year. Another noted that finding time for staff training, especially for Head Start staff, became a problem because staff members now work more hours and therefore have less time available for training. Another training issue mentioned was that staff need to know the policies and procedures of both agencies or program types.

Dealing with *differing fiscal year and cost allocation requirements* has also been daunting for some. One respondent wrote: "Documenting the various funding streams and allocating costs correctly is extremely complicated." Another observed that "the funding sources at the federal and state levels did not discuss up-front the issues that might arise as a result of the requirements for FDFY funding, so not enough information about funding peculiarities was available to our partners before we engaged them in discussion." This respondent also saw that the rapid changes brought on by welfare reform were taking a toll on partner agencies: "Many of our partners are in systemic chaos due to the rapid changes in process and size they are experiencing."

Several respondents also identified the requirement that parents be given a choice of programs as a barrier. One, for example, reported that the local county human resources agency "thought they could do a lot more to promote our project with their clients. Subsequent legislation stipulated that parents must be given four referrals. . . . This policy limited the type of promotion county officials had promised in the planning phase."

The inadequate number of facilities was noted by more than one respondent: (1) "Facilities—there are not enough facilities that can be licensed to continue the expansion easily. Facilities can be built, but it is a time-consuming process, and often it is difficult to find land"; and (2) "Although increases in funding have been allocated, outfitting new classrooms and hiring new staff would consume most of the increased funding."

Several respondents who believed rates were too low identified state program reimbursement rates as a barrier.

Other barriers noted by one or more respondents included *liability issues, confidentiality, staff salaries,* and a *scarcity of available partners.*

5. Strategies to gain feedback from families. Respondents were asked to list strategies used to gain input from Head Start families as well as families in the targeted expansion population.

The majority of respondents relied on a variety of needs assessment instruments, such as a review of Head Start family needs assessments and family partnership agreements and TANF family surveys done by local welfare departments. Many respondents also utilized parent forums, such as the Head Start Parent Policy Council and Child Development Parent Advisory committees, to gain feedback on partnership plans. Several respondents also utilized parent data from the local R&R.

Finally, the simplest strategy offered was: "Just ask them what they need!"

6. Broad, unresolved issues. Providers were asked to identify broad issues that were still unresolved (state or local). In preparing the report, we often included

the answers given in response to another survey item: "Explain other broad policy issues that emerged and were addressed as part of the collaborative and expansion efforts."

As in the responses to the survey question on barriers, most respondents who reported unresolved issues identified *differing state and federal guidelines and regulations.* Among those issues, *low Head Start family income guidelines* were mentioned most frequently as a continuing problem. Others mentioned such barriers as providing " . . . ongoing funding in a full-year Head Start model with clients whose child care reimbursement is time-limited." Other differences noted were the number of children served in each classroom and differing quality indicators and assessment tools.

Several respondents asked for *coordinated policy guidance from the state and federal levels:* "Federal and state departments need to work together to reinforce collaborative efforts at that level so that the field operators know that partnering is an acceptable model." Another respondent put it this way: "[we] need to have CDD adopt an MOU with the federal DHHS to ensure [that] collaboration proceeds to enable children to be served." And another pointed out that in general, the state and federal agencies should agree upon the need to collaborate to serve children, allowing flexibility to best serve the needs of children and families when state and federal eligibility requirements must be met.

Other unresolved issues mentioned in different surveys included *salary disparities, lack of facilities, R&R issues, and liability concerns.* Two out of the 16 survey respondents noted *no unresolved issues.*

7. **Positive outcomes. Respondents were asked to describe the positive elements in and outcomes from their partnerships.**

The overwhelming majority of respondents reported that *supporting families' needs for employment and providing high-quality early learning for their children* were the most positive outcomes of their partnerships. A typical comment was: "Our families have increased options for care and education. Quality is enhanced. FCCH providers are supported and less isolated, a condition which will positively affect their recruitment and retention. Resources are maximized as they are shared." Another response was stated more bluntly: "Parents do not need or want part-day, part-year anymore, and with the TANF requirements, many of them are unable to use them." And, simply stated, "It's a struggle, but it's worth it in terms of what it means to families."

The second most widely noted positive element was the *sharing or maximizing of resources,* including personnel, facilities, training, equipment, funding, and curricula.

Many respondents also noted *much-improved relationships with their partners.* For example, one wrote: "Staff participate in joint trainings and professional development opportunities, which allows for the sharing of resources and personnel and adds to the overall richness of both programs. We have incorporated many CDD concepts into our Head Start expansion programs as Head Start moves toward operating full-day, year-round programs." Another said: "There is a genuine desire on the part of local agencies to 'come to the table' and attempt to reduce turf issues." And from a third: "We are beginning to bridge the gap between State Preschool and Head Start staff."

Others noted *positive effects on the entire child care and development system*: "When it works well, this system allows the R&R to be the one single resource for child care referrals, both [for] those that are subsidized and those that are not. It is a fairly seamless process for a parent who sees the sequence of the relationship between Health and Human Services, resource and referral agencies, and Head Start. The discussion about child care priorities occurs at the Local Child Care Planning Council, where the needs of all providers—both public and private, for-profit and not-for-profit—can be openly aired and determined in consensus fashion." Another put it this way: "In developing new working relationships, opportunities emerge to learn and teach

with partners. Producing successful programs creates synergy among partners that gets directed toward improving and expanding early childhood development services."

Closer to home, several respondents noted the *benefits to partnership staff*, including (1) the ability to offer, for the first time ever, full-time/full-year employment; and (2) improved staff retention because of enhanced training and less isolation for FCCH providers.

Other respondents noted that the *transition to kindergarten had been improved, outreach had expanded, and parents became more knowledgeable.* One respondent noted that the *"state collaboration people are finally identifying issues to be solved cooperatively."*

> *"I am supportive of proposals that combine multiple funding sources to provide extended child care and development services."*
>
> *—Delaine Eastin*
> *California State Superintendent of Public Instruction*

State and Federal Activities Affecting Partnerships

SEVERAL ACTIVITIES ARE TAKING PLACE AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL THAT ARE INTENDED TO HELP STATE and local agencies form blended funding and other types of collaborative partnerships:

- The Head Start and Child Care Bureaus have formed a work group charged with defining and resolving blended-funding issues. Serving as co-chairs are Tom Shultz of the Head Start Bureau and Lillian Sugarman of the Child Care Bureau.
- The Administration for Children and Families (ACF) has formed a new training and technical assistance initiative—Quality in Linking Together (QUILT): Early Education Partnerships—to provide assistance with partnerships at the local, state, tribal, territorial, regional, and national levels.
- Amendments to the Head Start Act in October of 1998 included several relating to partnerships:

  Section 640(g)(2) specifies several additional criteria in allocating program expansion funds, including the applicant's ability to collaborate with other child care providers to provide full-day/full-year services and the applicant's plans to coordinate and foster partnerships with other community providers.

  Sections 640 (a)(5)(B) and 640 (a)(5)(C) establish new mandates for Head Start State Collaboration Offices to foster unified planning for full-day/full-year services.

  Section 640(a)(5)(E)(i) requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to "review and develop mechanisms" to resolve barriers to collaboration with other child care/early education programs and to resolve administrative and programmatic conflicts that inhibit the provision of unified child care services.

Section 640(a)(5)(E)(ii) permits equipment and supplies purchased by Head Start programs to be shared with non-Head Start participants in blended-funding partnerships

Section 645(b) allows Head Start to collect copayments when engaged in full-day partnerships with other agencies that collect copayments, with the provision that copayment rates shall not exceed those charged to other families with similar incomes and circumstances.

Section 648 establishes new priorities for training and technical assistance, including collaborative efforts to provide quality full-day/full-year services.

State Activities

Concurrently, CDD is working to address state partnership issues. In the past, waivers of CDD policy have been granted to assist several full-day/full-year partnerships. In most cases, however, waivers are only a stopgap—rather than permanent—solution. During the winter of 1999, CDD, in cooperation with CHSSCO, will form a work group composed of partners from Head Start and state-funded programs and CDE staff to examine the types of barriers, both real and perceived, described in this report. The work group will make recommendations to CDD regarding existing state and federal rules and regulations and suggest possible solutions to the barriers to collaborative partnerships.

"In addition to federal and state budget constraints and dwindling resources, funds for early childhood development and child care services are being further challenged by two new initiatives: welfare reform and federally directed child care collaboration. Both of these initiatives have a direct effect on the delivery of all services as they are currently provided. For example, mandated welfare reform work requirements necessitate the need for full-day child care services. Collaboration among federal, state, and local child care providers as well as other community agencies has become the official answer to meeting the unmet and increasing need for child care services."

—California Head Start Association Board Handbook

Appendix A

The Surveys: Information from the Survey Respondents

The summaries that follow include a description of each community and model. Successes as well as challenges and issues that remain unresolved are noted.

Summaries of Survey Responses

Respondent:

Napa-Solano Head Start
703 Jefferson Street
Napa, CA 94559
(707) 252-8931

Contact: **Jackie Dollar, Director**

Napa-Solano Head Start, a community action agency, provides home- and center-based services to over 850 children and their families in Napa and Solano counties. The service area is largely suburban and very diverse culturally. Solano County is one of the fastest growing counties in the state.

Partnership Types, Services, and Funding

An additional 100 children are now being served at three expansion sites offering a 12-month program. New staff members hired for the expansion include ten aides, ten teachers, an area team supervisor, three family advocates, and one substitute teacher.

All three sites are operated collaboratively by Head Start, the Napa County Health and Human Services Department, the Solano County Health and Human Services Department, and the R&Rs from both counties. County eligibility workers refer families in transition from welfare to work to their county's R&R, which provides each family with a child care voucher. Families may choose the providers they prefer, but those who stand to benefit from Head Start are encouraged to read Head Start literature and visit a Head Start site. If a family chooses Head Start, the program provides wraparound, full-day/full-year

services and is reimbursed $100 per week by the R&R through an invoice system. The families served are primarily in Stage 1 of the CalWorks program.

Alternative Payment monies provided by the local Health and Human Services (HHS) departments paid 35 percent of the funding per child. Community programs provided renovation funding of $165,000 and five years' rent at a total of $125,000.

Successful Strategies for Establishing Partnerships and Overcoming Barriers

When the expansion funding was announced, Head Start brought together the R&Rs and the counties' HHS staff to discuss mutual interests and needs. One of the collaboratives brought in more than $200,000 in funding for one of the Head Start facilities. Head Start staff provided training to HHS staff to facilitate appropriate referrals. Local newspapers agreed to publish numerous articles about the availability of full-day/full-year services. The R&R mailing lists were used to send out more than 1,000 informational letters to potential participants. Local child care planning councils acted as forums to discuss implementation issues.

Sources of Support Utilized in the Collaborative Process

Head Start listed the local planning councils, which helped to define obstacles and advocate solutions; the R&Rs, which acted as clearinghouses and the single point of contact for families attempting to access child care; city redevelopment funds, which assisted in building renovation; and local agencies, which agreed to publish outreach information to get the word out about Head Start full-day services.

Barriers and Policy Issues

Issues related to funding differences, especially those related to state and federal fiscal budget years, have been problematic. The program reported that the requirements of the different bureaucracies do not mesh, requiring local agency participants to be as flexible as possible. Policies of some of the partners were characterized as "not family-friendly." Hours of child care, income eligibility, hours of operation, billing, and state budget realities have prevented the collaborative from being as successful as the Head Start program feels it could have been had they been given control over full-day dollars by the federal government.

Head Start reported that several of its partners are in systemic chaos because of rapid growth, changing practices, new and inexperienced staff, and unclear procedures brought about by welfare reform. Further, each county uses a different process for families to access child care, making standardization more difficult. County procedures and policies were described as slow to change. One month into the program, Head Start had only 50 percent enrollment in one county. Through working closely with the HHS agency in the county, the program hopes to reach 100 percent enrollment within several months.

Broad, Unresolved Issues

Head Start reported a belief that a system developed by one of the local R&Rs to establish family eligibility was "difficult" and kept the R&R from guiding families through the system in a timely manner. One R&R had to return unspent funding for child care. This situation occurred in part because some families chose exempt care (i.e., child care provided by a family member at home rather than child care provided at a Head Start site). At the same time, the R&Rs were described as having run out of funding for vouchers. Later conversations with Head Start indicated that this situation no longer exists. Income eligibility was also described as a problem. HHS agencies have been noted, at times, to have authorized too few hours for child care for it to be cost-effective for Head Start to enroll them.

Other difficulties are experienced because families may use Head Start for only one year and then must change providers. And when families have children of varying ages, they might have multiple providers. Transportation difficulties may also make care by relatives more convenient, keeping the revenue in the family or household.

Strategies Used to Gain Feedback from Parents

Head Start assessed local needs by surveying Head Start parents to assess child care needs and determine the percentage of families on AFDC who would be making the transition from welfare. Then a letter was sent to all families on TANF through the R&R and the HHS departments. Articles were printed in local papers and in nonprofit and community newsletters and bulletins. Presentations were made to community groups and at local weekend events where concentrations of eligible families would be in attendance. Head Start staff members provide initial and continuing outreach and training for county eligibility workers.

Positive Outcomes

To alleviate some of the problems, the collaborating agencies are developing a centralized waiting list and a universal application. The system now is described as one that allows the local R&Rs to act as the single resource for child care referrals regardless of whether they are subsidized. Local child care priorities and needs are discussed at local planning council meetings, where the needs of all providers can be aired openly and determined by consensus. Head Start describes the entire system as now being "fairly" seamless for families (if not, as yet, for the professional partners).

Head Start also reports that the local collaborative now ensures the most appropriate setting for each family by means of a seamless service day and teacher continuity. Head Start also reports that another potential collaboration has come about: The local Private Industry Council recently approached Napa-Solano Head Start about supplementing child care hours to allow parents enrolled in Head Start to attend training classes. Head Start and one HHS agency have also developed an MOU to locate HHS staff at Head Start to facilitate service delivery to families.

Respondent:

El Dorado County Office of Education
6767 Green Valley Road
Placerville, CA 95667
(530) 622-7130, ext. 270;
FAX (530) 626-9511

Contact: **Susanne Milton, Assistant Director**

El Dorado County Office of Education (COE) Head Start provides home-based, center-based, early Head Start, and regular Head Start services to 301 children in El Dorado County. The service area is largely rural, with isolated communities in mountainous terrain, including the Lake Tahoe area. Work opportunities tend to be seasonal, and winter weather conditions can be severe. The area lacks adequate low-income housing and transportation.

Partnership Types, Services, and Funding

An additional 82 children are being served at four expansion sites, each offering a 12-month program. New staff hired for the expansion include three aides, six teachers, three specialists (family/community assistants), four component assistants (health, disabilities, education), and a clerk typist.

This program collaborates with California Department of Social Services funding sources as well as the following:

- El Dorado County Child Care
- El Dorado County Office of Education State Preschool, with wraparound and wrap-in options in Head Start, both center-based and home-based

El Dorado COE listed its direct service partners as State Preschool and state General Child Care, providing home- and center-based services.

Successful Strategies for Establishing Partnerships and Overcoming Barriers

The program looked at ways to blend requirements to meet those of all programs and at ways to serve families without duplicating services, thereby saving funding.

Barriers and Policy Issues

The program cited a number of areas in which differences create barriers:

- Income guidelines for families
- Priorities for recruitment and enrollment between state and federal programs
- Enrollment procedures and processes
- Salary schedules of staff
- Days of operation

Support services (health and parent education) were cited as broad policy issues that emerged as part of collaborative and expansion efforts.

Broad, Unresolved Issues

- Salary schedules
- Differing parent income guidelines/parent fees
- Days of operation
- Lack of involvement or financial support from R&R or AP

Strategies Used to Gain Feedback from Parents

- Surveys
- Telephone
- Policy council/class committee meetings with Parents Advisory Board

Positive Outcomes

- Extended days and extended months of services
- Extended hours of services for providing benefits to children not enrolled in Head Start
- Providing services to more families not enrolled but co-located at Head Start sites (e.g., in-services, parent involvement)
- Sharing of site costs for electricity, water, and sewer service

---

Respondent:

Sonoma County People for Economic Opportunity Head Start
617 Sebastopol Road
Santa Rosa, CA 95407
(707) 544-6171; FAX (707) 544-0771

Contact: **Ofelia Ochoa-Morris, Director**

Sonoma County People for Economic Opportunity Head Start is a community action organization that provides regular Head Start center-based services to more than 498 children and their families in Sonoma County. The service area covers rural, suburban, and urban school districts.

Collaborative Models, Services, and Funding

Two expansion sites serve 34 children, offering a 12-month program. New staff hired for the expansion include four aides, four teachers, one specialist, one bus driver, two area supervisors, two family outreach workers, one family/health assistant, and 1 clerical assistant for a total of 16 additional staff.

Roseland School District's state-funded preschool and River Child Care's state-funded preschool are the two collaborative partners. Both projects join Head Start and State Preschool in partnership to provide families with a morning day care/State Preschool session of up to four hours. The Head Start class operates for five hours each afternoon, five days a week, ten to eleven months per year. Sonoma County People for Economic Opportunity Head Start's direct services partners with State Preschool to provide center-based preschool services and Head Start comprehensive services.

State Preschool funds are $117,798, providing 22 percent of total funds allocated. Head Start provides $413,198, or 78 percent of the total funds.

Successful Strategies for Establishing Partnerships and Overcoming Barriers

Head Start provided support, start-up funding for renovations, examples of leases, curriculum, and staff development plans. The partnership was flexible regarding time frames and recruitment of families. Head Start obligated some of its "over-income" slots to meet the state-funded income eligibility requirements because the income eligibility criteria for the two are different.

Sources of Support Utilized in the Collaborative Process

Other Head Start directors and staff provided support for Sonoma County People for Economic Opportunity.

Barriers and Policy Issues

- Federal and state income guidelines do not match; allowable income for State Preschool families is much higher than Head Start's income limits.
- State Preschool programs were scheduled for only nine months per year, creating difficulties in establishing an extended program year.
- State Preschool programs were hesitant to partner with Head Start because they were not sure whether CDD approved the model; consistent guidance was not available.
- State and federal governments need to coordinate Request for Proposals (RFP) to consistently reinforce that partnerships be given priority.
- Partnerships are time-consuming and require a solid commitment from both partners. Information-sharing regarding program operations, regulations, philosophies, and many more details should occur prior to the final commitment to form a partnership.
- The state allocates funds for State Preschools to create their own full-day programs, thereby eliminating the need for collaboration with Head Start. One developing partnership disintegrated because the school district applied for state funds to provide full-day/full-year services.
- Sonoma County Head Start curriculum does not observe holidays, an unusual approach for state-funded preschools that were trying to establish partnerships.
- Prior to the final commitment to create a partnership, the issues of time and commitment as well as information-sharing, regarding program operations, regulations, philosophies, and many more details, were cited as barriers to creating the partnerships.

Broad, Unresolved Issues

- Collaborative efforts between federal and state departments need to be reinforced and field operators need to know that partnering is an acceptable model.
- Federal and state departments should model collaboration when allocating funding and setting priority models. Failing to do so leads to confusion and frustration.

Strategies Used to Gain Feedback from Parents

A parent needs survey has been distributed to parents each year by Sonoma County People for Economic Opportunity Head Start. The parents surveyed have prioritized the types of child care service they need. Families identify the type of child day care needed at the time of application to the program. Indirect feedback has been gained from the target population by referring to the following documents: Sonoma County Child Care Planning Council Fact Sheet; Child Care Action Plan; River Child Care Resource and Referral Agency; and SCPEO Head Start Child Plus database reports.

Positive Outcomes

Communities in Sonoma County are provided with new services that can offer families on waiting lists and working poor families viable options. The communities now share a more comprehensive child development model with the existing preschools. The center-based, extended-day program options with co-enrolled slots provide a full-year program.

Respondent:

Neighborhood House Association
5660 Copely Drive
San Diego, CA 92111
(619) 527-3304; FAX (619) 527-3308

Contact: **Sarah Brassert, Acting Area Director**

The Neighborhood House Association is a multipurpose, nonprofit agency that provides regular Head Start and early Head Start home-based and center-based services to children and their families in San Diego County. The service area contains both suburban and urban regions.

Partnership Types, Services, and Funding

At this time 176 additional children are being served at 21 expansion sites offering a 12-month option. New staff hired for the expansion include 11 aides, 11 teachers, and 2 specialists.

The expansion sites are designed to meet the needs of parents who are working and/or attending school/training. The sites implement nontraditional hours, offering evening and extended-day care. During the last expansion, a family child care option was implemented. An Early Head Start program was implemented in September of 1998.

The Neighborhood House Association Head Start Program has three sites that are colocated with Child Development Division programs (General Child Care) and Head Start. The sites are as follows:

- Naval Training Center (105 Head Start; 51 CDD; 32 Early Head Start)
- First Step (90 Head Start; 34 CDD)
- Jackie Robinson (90 Head Start; 16 CDD)

Services include child development, health, disability, parent involvement, and social services to meet the revised performance standards as well as the funding terms and conditions and EPS. The services provided blend state General Child Care center-based slots, Head Start expansion center-based slots, and Early Head Start center-based slots.

Successful Strategies for Establishing Partnerships and Overcoming Barriers

Staff meetings and parent meetings are held together, and issues pertaining to Head Start and CDD programs are discussed in an open forum. CDD parents serve on the Head Start Policy Council as community representatives.

Joint staff development opportunities are encouraged. Cross training is promoted; for example, CDD and Head Start staff are encouraged to attend training specifically designed for the other program.

Sources of Support Utilized in the Collaborative Process

The greatest source of support is the template, developed by the Early Head Start consultant, that will assist in merging the three programs.

Barriers and Policy Issues

The Head Start and CDD programs have two different sets of rules; however, staff are working toward a clearer understanding of the similarities between the two programs.

A template for program implementation for Early Head Start is being broadened to encompass Head Start and CDD, and the template will serve as a procedure manual for all three programs.

Broad, Unresolved Issues

None were noted by the Neighborhood House Association.

Strategies Used to Gain Feedback from Parents

Strategies used to gain feedback are Parent Center meetings, Policy Council meetings, the family partnership process, and the community assessment process.

Positive Outcomes

"Staff participate in joint training and professional development opportunities which allows for the sharing of resources and personnel and adds to the overall richness of both programs. We have incorporated many CDD concepts into our Head Start expansion programs as Head Start

moves toward operating full-day/full-year programs. The CDD 'contract hours' policy has been particularly helpful. We have been working hard to merge the two programs and to draw on the positive strengths of both . . ."

Respondent:

Northcoast Children's Services
P.O. Box 1165
Arcata, CA 95521
(707) 822-7206; FAX (707) 822-7962

Contact: **Siddiq Kilkenny, Head Start/Early Head Start Director**

Northcoast Children's Services is a single-purpose, nonprofit agency that provides Early Head Start and regular Head Start home-based and center-based services to more than 615 children and their families in Humboldt and Del Norte counties. The service area is rural and large (approximately 4,500 square miles), with many isolated communities. The area suffers chronically from a high rate of unemployment, and reimbursement rates for child care certificates, vouchers, and centers are very low.

Partnership Type, Services, and Funding

An additional 88 children are now being served at 7 expansion sites that offer the 12-month option. New staff hired for the expansion include three teachers, one home visitor, and one support staff. In addition, approximately 15 teachers are being moved from half-time to full-time. The expansion sites offer the 12-month option.

Partnerships that have been established or are "in the works" include:

- Internal partnerships with state-funded programs (Northcoast Children's Services)
- External partnerships with state-funded programs (Eureka City Schools)
- Tentative agreements with R&R (Humboldt County)
- Tentative agreement with CalWORKs (Humboldt County)
- Partnership with College of the Redwoods and Del Norte Child Care Council nearing completion

Northcoast listed state General Child Care, center-based, and alternative payment as direct-services partners. State General Child Care is provided by Northcoast as well as by early child care services. Vouchers and certificates are used for child care services under the AP program.

Successful Strategies for Establishing Partnerships and Overcoming Barriers

- Strategic planning, goal setting with groups involved, and partners
- Recognition that all partners must have something to gain
- Continuous work on developing commitment and trust

Sources of Support Utilized in the Collaborative Process

The Healthy Start initiative and Family Preservation and Support (FPSP) funding

Barriers and Policy Issues

- Board of Directors' concerns about liability
- Territorial issues and the fear it creates
- Limitations of categorical funding
- Development of a confidentiality protocol to deal with confidentiality issue

Broad, Unresolved Issues

- Legislature grants no empowerment to local child care planning councils.
- The Department of Social Services (DSS) lacks experience with child care issues.
- The Legislature, DSS, and CDE lack understanding of the uniqueness of Head Start.
- Reimbursement rates for CDD-funded programs are low, affecting the ability to maintain quality staff (because of increased turnover and low salaries) and the ability to develop partnerships.

- The parent choice requirement for block grant child care vouchers precludes agreements to identify or reserve funds for Head Start centers for the extended-day option. Simply stated, "parent choice" often precludes parents from choosing to keep their child in Head Start. R&Rs should be allowed to recommend high-quality programs.

Strategies Used to Gain Feedback from Parents

- Surveys completed by parents and teachers
- Family partnership agreements
- Family needs assessments
- Focus groups
- The strategic planning process

Positive Outcomes

- Shared facilities
- Shared goals
- Shared funding categories
- Better outcomes for families

Respondent:

Merced County Community Action Agency
P.O. Box 2085
Merced, CA 95344-0085
(209) 723-4771; FAX (209) 723-0950
E-mail: mccaa@cyberlynk.com
Contact: **Christine Traub, Director HS/CDS**

Merced County Community Action Agency provides regular center-based Head Start services to 1,173 children and their families in Merced County. The service area is largely rural, with suburban pockets.

Partnership Type, Services, and Funding

An additional 80 children are being served at four expansion sites offering a 12-month program. New staff hired for the expansion include two aides, three teachers, three specialists, one cook, and two center supervisors, for a total of eleven additional staff.

The following two models are being used:

Wrap-in. Head Start comprehensive services are extended to Head Start-eligible children who are enrolled in a full-day care program funded by CDD. The Merced and Los Banos child development centers are being used as models, and Head Start services will be wrapped into the child care program for 20 Head Start-eligible children per center. The Head Start program will provide quality enrichment and will be responsible for meeting the performance standards for the Head Start eligible families and children.

Wraparound. Head Start will combine services with CDD-funded General Child Care to offer extended-day services for children whose parents need longer child care hours. State-funded child care is provided in the Head Start facilities for 20 children per center. Operational hours will be 7 a.m. to 6 p.m. Child care hours will be 7 a.m. to 8 a.m. and 11:30 a.m. to 6 p.m. Head Start will operate from 8 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. During the Head Start hours, the children will receive comprehensive services. The costs for staff, rent, utilities, food, maintenance, administration, and supplies are shared. Head Start is responsible for meeting the performance standards. This model will have a positive impact for the children and their families. The number of class days will total 246 per year.

Using wraparound as the funding source for facilities costs, the state General Child Care total is $26,820. This amount is shared 41 percent by Head Start and 59 percent by General Child Care, based on the total number of children served.

Funding for the two models is provided by Head Start and state General Child Care. For the wrap-in program, Head Start funds $2,264 for each center adviser position. The costs for the wraparound program are shared as shown in the tables that follow.

Delhi Wraparound Costs **Facility Cost Breakdown**

Facility costs		Head Start share, 41%	General Child Care share, 59%
Rent	$24,000	$9,940	$14,060
Garbage	220	91	129
Telephone	500	207	293
Maintenance Pest/ex svcs	500	207	293
Total costs	**$25,220**	**$10,445**	**$14,775**

Percentages are based on total number of children served.

Salary Calculations

Position	Hours	Days	$ per hour	HS %	GCC %	Total per position
Center Super.*	8	260	10.76	6,573.38	15,807.42	22,380.80
Teacher* Assistant	8	260	8.94	5,461.53	13,133.67	18,595.20
Teacher* Cook/	8	260	7.46	4,557.38	10,959.42	15,516.80
Custodian*	8	205	8.64	5,278.25	12,692.95	17,971.20
Fringe**				5,030.23	12,096.49	17,126.72
Total				**$26,900.77**	**$64,689.95**	**$91,590.72**

*Percentages are based on total hours of operations vs. hours of Head Start or CD.

**Fringe is calculated at 23 percent.

Atwater Castle Wraparound Costs **Facility Calculations**

Facility costs		Head Start share, 83%	General Child Care share, 17%
Rent	$38,400	$31,714	$6,686
Power	2,148	1,774	374
Water/Sewer	1,011	835	176
Lawn Care	1,344	1,110	234
Garbage	912	753	159
Telephone	986	815	172
Maintenance	1,279	1,056	223
Total cost	**$46,080**	**$38,057**	**$8,023**

Head Start share is already funded.

Salary Calculations

Position	Hours	Days	$ per hour	HS %	GCC %	Total per position
Center Super**	8	50	11.68	2,055.68	2,616.32	4,672.00
Teacher**	8	260	8.94	8,181.89	10,413.31	18,595.20
Teacher**	8	210	8.94	6,608.45	8,410.75	15,019.20
Assistant Teacher**	8	260	7.46	6,827.39	8,689.41	15,516.80
Cook***	8	205	8.68	12,669.33	1,565.87	14,235.20
Fringe****				8,358.83	7,290.00	15,648.83
Total				**$44,701.57**	**$38,985.67**	**$83,687.23**

*Totals based on 20 children in CD program vs 71 Total @ Castle (20/71=28%; 50/71=72%)
**Totals based on hours worked per day for Head Start vs CD (3.5/4.5; 3.5/8=44%; 4.5/8=56%)
***Based on 20 children in CD program vs 201 children served
****Fringe calculated @ 23%

Successful Strategies for Establishing Partnerships

Merced County Community Action Agency had already operated Head Start and Child Development programs and followed established practices when dealing with child forms, gathering family information, conducting program evaluations, and so forth. The agency decided to use the most stringent requirements, which—in most cases—are those of Head Start.

Sources of Support Utilized in the Collaborative Process

The agency identified in-house staff and data gathered from their CDD records (such as attendance, family make-up, eligibility, review of all waiting lists for their programs, Head Start, Child Development, and State Preschool) as their greatest sources of support.

Barriers and Policy Issues

- Low reimbursement for children in child development programs
- Future colocated programs in other communities where we currently operate child development programs

Broad, Unresolved Issues

- Ongoing, full reimbursement for child development so that the program will not lack funds
- Clarification of the terminology used in the child development funding terms and conditions
- Need for more clearly stated standards, authorization, and policies for colocated programs
- Combining of Title V and funding terms and conditions into one manual

Strategies Used to Gain Feedback from Parents

The strategies used by the Merced County Community Action Agency to gain feedback from Head Start parents and targeted expansion parents have been the countywide Child Development Parent Advisory Committee meetings and the countywide Head Start Parent Policy Council meetings.

Positive Outcomes

- Parents are becoming more knowledgeable about comprehensive services.
- Space is better utilized.
- Outreach to communities has increased.

Respondent:

Santa Cruz Community Counseling Center (Head Start)
408 E. Lake Avenue
Watsonville, CA 95076
(831) 688-3802; FAX (831) 724-3534
E-mail: sccohs@cruzio.com
Contact: **Pamela Elders, Program Director**

Santa Cruz Community Counseling Center is a multipurpose, nonprofit agency that provides regular Head Start home-based and center-based services to 411 children and their families in Santa Cruz County. The service area is largely suburban, with isolated agricultural labor camps, and serves a large Latino population with many monolingual Spanish speakers. The cost of living is high, yet many families have low-paying jobs with no benefits. The county has low literacy levels.

Partnership Type, Services, and Funding

An additional 20 children are being served as a result of the expansion. Four new staff were hired for the expansion: one specialist; one release-time teacher; one special-needs aide; and one family services worker. One expansion site offers the full-day/full-year option.

The partnership is a collaborative between the Head Start grantee and the Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA) of Watsonville. The target population is Head Start-eligible families participating in TANF who have obtained approved welfare-to-work plans and child care vouchers. The YWCA employs the teaching staff and is a Child Care Food Program sponsor. Head Start developed a portable building and play area on YWCA property and will provide a Head Start overlay of services. Head Start employs a child care program specialist who will oversee Head Start services, supervise a family service worker, and work with the YWCA teacher-director to ensure that the education component complies with performance standards.

Funding is received from Child Care Food Program (YWCA via CDE); the AP program; YWCA (child care and CCFP sponsor); and Head Start.

Start-up funding and a year's planning time were critical to this project.

Successful Strategies for Establishing Partnerships and Overcoming Barriers

- Clear MOUs
- Persistence, dedication, and energy
- Regular meetings between collaborating agencies
- Dedicated staff who support collaborative efforts, serve as family advocates, and work with welfare-to-work staff
- A public-relations campaign and effective recruitment strategies, providing outreach to families
- Flexibility, on both the personnel and financial fronts, to change policies and procedures to accommodate welfare reform

Sources of Support Utilized in the Collaborative Process

Santa Cruz Community Counseling Center cites its local human resources agency staff, the local child care planning council, Career Works, and the local R&R as the greatest sources of support in the collaborative process.

Barriers and Policy Issues

- *Planning in a fluid environment.* Planning was done over a year in advance, while welfare reform was also in the planning stage. Changes have occurred which may yet affect the collaborative partnership. The county human resources agency originally thought it could do more to promote the project with its clients, but subsequent legislation stipulated that parents must be given four referrals (done by the local R&R), limiting the types of promotion efforts county officials were allowed to make.
- *Personnel policies/pay scales.* Both collaborating agencies must work around their

own policies and pay scales. Salaries and benefits of one agency may be lower than those of the other. This situation may create equity issues, within and between agencies, and recruitment problems.

- *Developing a clear MOU.* Skillful negotiation is needed to develop an MOU that clearly states roles, expectations, responsibilities, financial commitments, and liability.
- *Buy-in from top to bottom.* All levels within an agency, from the Board to line staff, must understand and "buy in" to the collaboration.
- *Different resources.* Resource limitations of one or both agencies may be problematic in achieving a program that meets Head Start performance standards fully. The lack of expansion funds from the state for General Child Care (preschool children) means that the project will depend on voucher reimbursement.
- *Income guidelines.* Head Start income guidelines are too low. Many families who are welfare-linked, but slightly over income (have a job, are not receiving aid, and are still vulnerable to job loss), could be eligible by state standards.
- *Limited phase 1–3 funding.* Recruitment turned up families participating in welfare-to-work activities who did not have an approved child care plan. For example, welfare staff said that a disabled father at home could take care of children and that a dad working at night and sleeping during the day could care for a three-year-old. Staff worked with families and the county child care program to secure vouchers for eligible families.
- *Cost allocation issues.* The programs are beginning to look at cost allocation issues between Head Start and the partner agency.
- *Liability and other issues.* Liability and different regulatory requirements, expectations, funding levels, and eligibility guidelines also are issues.

Broad, Unresolved Issues

- Head Start income guidelines are too low.
- State General Child Care funds are unavailable, so the project will not be entirely funded by the voucher reimbursement.
- In our full-day program, State Preschool will not work.
- The state's rate of per-child funding is low.

Strategies Used to Gain Feedback from Parents

Strategies used by the Santa Cruz Community Counseling Center to gain feedback from Head Start parents as well as parents in the targeted expansion population are (1) surveys distributed and completed by Head Start parents; (2) surveys of AFDC parents distributed by the county welfare agency; and (3) the use of demographic data.

Positive Outcomes

The community will benefit from full-day/full-year child care services that are delivered in a Head Start format, making the services higher in quality and more comprehensive than most full-day/full-year child care programs.

Head Start understands collaboration and has expertise it can share with the child care community in the areas of family focus, curriculum, training resources, and parent participation.

Respondent:

Monterey County Head Start
P. O. Box 80851
Salinas, CA 93912
(831) 755-0352; FAX (831) 755-6480
E-mail: rtellez@monterey-k12.ca.us

Contact: **Ricardo Tellez, Program Director**

The County Office of Education administers Monterey County Head Start, which provides regular center-based Head Start services to

943 children and their families in Monterey County. The service area is largely suburban.

Partnership Types, Services, and Funding

An additional 120 children are being served as a result of the expansion. New staff hires for the expansion total five: three specialists, one secretary, and one program manager. Two expansion sites offer a full-day/full-year option, and two other expansion sites offer a 10-month option (September through May). The program is center-based and uses a Head Start model with before- and after-school care and/or preschool services.

Monterey County Head Start has direct services partnerships with State Preschool, State General Child Care, and other Head Starts. The funding amount of $6,235,154 comes from Head Start, with an 80-percent representation. State Preschool and State General Child Care were listed as providers of undetermined funds and percentages. Actual matching sources were not disclosed.

Successful Strategies for Establishing Partnerships

Richard Tellez came to Monterey County Head Start as a new director on July 1, 1998, and is unable to share all that was intended prior to his start date. The following describes developments that have occurred since his arrival:

- Met with decision makers to clarify roles
- Shared the "how-to" materials (e.g., forms, policies, procedures, sample program plans, and reports) to gain an understanding of and support the success of program goals
- Offered planned-out training and technical assistance that address the specific needs of each delegate partner
- Provided service-area support from Monterey County Office of Education Head Start personnel for parent involvement training, education services, social and health services, disabilities, and so forth
- Held regular problem-solving meetings
- Assigned a program manager from the administrative office to establish ongoing communication

Sources of Support Utilized in the Collaborative Process

Monterey County Head Start identified the greatest sources of support and information utilized in their collaborative and expansion efforts as the Fiscal Guidelines OMB circulars, the Region IX Head Start Office, and their in-house staff.

Barriers and Policy Issues

Monterey County Head Start has identified the following issues and barriers to creating collaborative partnerships as follows:

- Ownership issues (role clarification and contract management)
- Initial start-up difficulties
- Knowledge of Head Start performance standards for partners and how to comply with them
  - Writing a program plan
  - Enrollment timelines
  - Parent Policy Council
  - Other program requirements
- Staff turnover
- Funding confusion
- Regulations from multiple funding sources
- Reporting requirements from multiple funding sources
- Training

Monterey County Head Start also cited funding guidelines and reporting requirements, the merging of forms for reporting purposes, and attempts to implement flexibility, whenever possible, for fiscal requirements.

Broad, Unresolved Issues

Monterey County Head Start cited (1) the policies of its Board of Directors and the school board that create conflicts in decision making; (2) timelines to approve licensing contracts; and (3) regulations and funding guidelines.

The program noted a need for joint training with the various funding agencies to identify the most common barriers as well as a need for a base "model" of how to collaborate without stifling creativity and autonomy. The agencies

that were listed as having shared joint training were the California Department of Education, State Preschool and General Child Care, and Region IX of the Head Start Bureau.

Strategies Used to Gain Feedback from Parents

In addition to its existing and growing waiting list, Monterey County Head Start used the Community Needs Assessment to support the need for expansion. The Monterey COE Head Start Parent Policy Council was presented with the expansion proposal for approval because the Director was not onboard during the start-up phase.

Positive Outcomes

- The number of children and families served has increased.
- The longer program day and extended year support the work and training schedules of families.
- Higher quality, comprehensive services are provided to children and families through the Head Start performance standards.
- Collaboration with school districts and CBOs has expanded.
- Such resources as training, capacity-building referrals, facilities, and administrative support are shared.
- Cost-effective measures of expansion for full-day/full-year model are carried out.
- Transition to kindergarten in the school district models now occurs.

Respondent:

Tulare County Office of Education
7000 Doe Avenue, Suite C
Visalia, CA 93291
(209) 651-3022

Contact: **Senaida Garcia, Project Director**

The Tulare County Office of Education provides home- and center-based services, migrant services, regular Head Start project services, and Family Child Care Network services to 3,500 children and their families in a largely rural county.

Partnership Type, Services, and Funding

Three expansion sites, offering full-day/full-year services, have accommodated an additional 120 children. A total of 32 new staff members were added for the expansion: 16 aides, 6 teachers, and 10 others, including one or more center supervisors, family service workers, nurses, personnel clerks, health aides, and translators.

The program was expanded by 120 full-day slots in three areas, two of which were unserved and one that was underserved. Forty of the slots were wrapped with General Child Care funds.

State Preschool funding of $1.2 million and state General Child Care funding of $1.6 million provided 28 percent of the total program funding. "We operate our program as colocated with cost allocation comingled. Every child, regardless of funding, receives a Head Start experience."

Successful Strategies for Establishing Partnerships and Overcoming Barriers

The grantee reported that its collaboration was facilitated through the grantee's status as a state contractor for General Child Care and development funds. Any barriers were internal and have been resolved through successful collaborations.

Sources of Support Utilized in the Collaborative Process

The local R&R and local welfare agencies provided the grantee with statistical data to support its federal funding request.

Barriers and Policy Issues

Eligibility coordination was listed by the grantee as the primary policy issue. No other policy issues or barriers were noted.

Broad, Unresolved Issues

None, state or local, were identified.

Strategies Used to Gain Feedback from Parents

Feedback was obtained from the Parent Policy Council, the waiting list from the child care and development centers, and the local R&R.

Positive Outcomes

Full-day/full-year services are now available to families in previously unserved and underserved areas.

Respondent:

San Juan Unified School District Head Start
5309 Kenneth Avenue
Carmichael, CA 95608
(916) 971-5910

Contact: **Karen Finley, Coordinator**

San Juan Unified School District provides home- and center-based services to 585 children in Sacramento County. Within the district boundaries, 46 percent of the population falls below the state median income, with 15 percent of the families receiving financial assistance. Fifty different languages are spoken by children attending district schools. Poverty, language barriers, and inadequate transportation prevent families from receiving needed services.

Partnership Types, Services, and Funding

An additional 162 children are being served at eleven expansion sites. Eight of those sites offer a 12-month option, and three offer a 10-month option (August through June). New staff hired for the expansion include eight aides, nine teachers, a health aide, a bilingual aide, a school community worker, a coordinator, and a clerical assistant.

The model provides extended-day services through its collaboration with state Preschool, state General Child Care funding, and Child Care and Development Block Grant funding. The model provides a seamless, 8 1/2-hour service day (7:45 am to 5:30 p.m.) and a partially state-funded experience blended with Head Start-enhanced child care/preschool at four sites. Enhanced services to the state-funded children include developmental, medical, and dental screenings; family social services support; psychological consultation and referral; and additional curricular support, resources, and training for teachers. All State Preschool funding ($318,981), state General Child Care funding ($159,491), and Child Care Block Grant funding ($159,491) were utilized with Head Start resources.

The chart on the following page was provided by the respondent and shows the services that were delivered prior to implementation of the partnership as well as the services that were delivered to children and families after the partnership was in place.

Services Now		Services after Partnership
Contract for services	↔	No change for children's centers extended day and State Preschool
Child's classroom	↔	No change
Classroom teachers	↔	No change for children's centers increase of child/staff ratio for State Preschool
Daily schedule (child's routine)	↔	No change
Food services (CCFP)	↔	No change
Vision and hearing screening	↔	No change
Furniture and materials	↔	Updated furniture and additional materials
Curriculum	↔	Additional support, resources, and training for teachers
Parent meetings	↔	Additional support and resources
		Developmental speech/language screening
		Medical and dental screening
		Additional special-education advocacy
		Family social services support (home visits, etc.)
		Psychologist consultation and referral
		Bilingual interpreter services in the classroom
		Availability of college tuition reimbursement for parents

Successful Strategies for Establishing Partnerships and Overcoming Barriers

- Frequent meetings with collaborative partners
- Flexibility in problem solving
- Acceptance of the notion that "change takes time"

Sources of Support Utilized in the Collaborative Process

- Sacramento Employment and Training Agency (the grantee)
- Community Care Licensing
- San Juan Unified School District

Barriers and Policy Issues

- Methods and approaches for meeting both federal and state mandates and guidelines, which often differ greatly
- Merging procedures for best meeting state and federal guidelines that conflict

Broad, Unresolved Issues

Some differences in state and federal programs we are continuing to examine are as follows:

- Attendance guidelines/absence reporting
- Numbers of children served per classroom
- Differing quality indicators
- Differing assessment tools

Strategies Used to Gain Feedback from Parents

- Parent meetings (site level)
- Parent Council meetings (districtwide representation)

Positive Outcomes

- Support for families' employment needs while providing quality early learning experiences for their children
- Increased communication between collaborative partners
- Sharing of resources between collaborative partners

Respondent:

Shasta Head Start Child Development, Inc.
1620 Market Street
Redding, CA 96001
(530) 241-1036

Contact: **Judith Englesby-Smith, Executive Director**

A private, nonprofit agency, Shasta Head Start provides early and regular Head Start services, home- and center-based, and is starting a Family Child Care Network. Services are provided to approximately 670 children and their families in Shasta, Siskiyou, and Trinity counties.

The three-county service area covers over 13,000 square miles and is characterized by mountainous terrain and severe weather conditions in summer and winter. Although largely rural, the area has urban pockets. The unemployment rate, exacerbated by a devastated timber industry, is more than twice as high as the state average.

Partnership Types, Services, and Funding

An additional 54 children are being served at three expansion sites. One site offers a 12-month, full-day schedule; the other two sites offer 10-month, full-day services (September through July). New staff hired for the expansion include two bilingual aides, three teachers, one child care specialist, three associate teachers, three cooks, and three bus drivers.

The three distinct models that were created for preschool-age children in the service area are described as follows:

1. The Butte Valley Rural Health Clinic provides State Preschool services in the morning and wraparound Head Start services in the afternoon. State Preschool provides health and education services, while Head Start provides extended-day services (five days), food service, transportation, social services, and tracking and monitoring of comprehensive care.
2. The Rother School site provides Even Start, Healthy Start, and Head Start services in Redding. Even Start provides parenting classes, GED, and ESL for parents, while Healthy Start provides counseling and health services. Head Start provides full-week, extended-day, and all other comprehensive services, including social services, education, parent involvement, and transportation.
3. Head Start, the Shasta Office of Education, and the local Department of Social Services collaborate to provide Head Start services in the morning, with classes funneling into extended-day services in the afternoon, five days per week. Funding is through AP monies and CalWorks reimbursements for TANF families who are working or in school.

In the first model, State Preschool funds of $50,200 (41 percent) provided education services five days a week, full-year, while Head Start funds of $70,790 (59 percent) provided nutrition, health, and social services as well as transportation and extended-day services. In the second model, Head Start funds of $66,121 (93 percent) provided comprehensive services, while AP funds of $4,750 (6 percent) provided extended-day, five-days-a-week services.

In the third model, Even Start funding of $6,253 (8 percent) provided ESL classes, parenting classes, and mental health services. Head Start provided extended-day, five-days-a-week, comprehensive services at $70,270 (92 percent).

Successful Strategies for Establishing Partnerships and Overcoming Barriers

- One-to-one personal contact
- Leadership in the Department of Social Services to connect TANF recipients with existing child care programs in Shasta County
- Recognition that neither State Preschool nor Head Start alone has enough funding to do extended day services (State Preschool has the funding; Head Start has the space)
- Joint training by Head Start, the California Department of Education, and state Department of Social Services on federal regulations and expectations
- A class at local college, co-taught by Head Start and the Family Child Care Association, for prospective providers—an activity that opened the door for dialogue with the family child care providers to accept into their care children served by Head Start

Sources of Support Utilized in the Collaborative Process

- Child Care Reference and Education and the local R&R
- The TANF social worker from DSS, who sat on the Head Start Policy Council
- Local child care planning councils
- The TANF parents themselves
- The hiring of two new child care specialists who carry out local networking and report back to the monthly management meeting
- CDPAC
- CHSA
- Mailings from the California Department of Education

Barriers and Policy Issues

- Differing populations are identified in state and federal guidelines.
- Low training standards exist among State Preschool staff in rural, isolated areas.
- The AP program in one county ran out of voucher funds by April of 1998. None of the Head Start families received assistance. Instead, they remained on the waiting list all year. Head Start paid the cost of a full-day program last year, but the current budget does not make that provision for this year.
- Priority must be given to Head Start families for AP if they are to benefit from collaborative efforts.
- The state child care system is just beginning to collaborate.
- Two county offices of education do not appear to realize that all the agencies need one another. We are still trying to educate them and help with problem solving.
- Family child care providers can be a part of this effort and are making good progress.

Broad, Unresolved Issues (State and Local)

- The cost per child is higher in Head Start because it provides comprehensive services; this incongruity can create competition among line staff.
- The attitude of the state's programs seems to be that the federal programs should make all the needed regulatory changes.
- AP funding is going to unlicensed/exempt providers rather than to licensed facilities.
- Head Start families need to know how they can access Alternative Payment monies.
- Agencies receiving CalWorks money (DSS, community colleges, PIC, and county offices of education) are not coordinating their efforts; all seem to be going off in separate directions, creating gaps or duplication in services.
- Superintendents of county offices of education prefer to have State Preschool programs located on district campuses

rather than at off-site Head Start centers. This attitude represents a missed opportunity for economical space and collaborative efforts.

Strategies Used to Gain Feedback from Parents

- Having the TANF social worker from DSS sit on the Head Start Policy Council to provide informational updates and answer questions
- Having welfare reform as a topic of every monthly parent-committee meeting
- Asking TANF parents to do training at staff meetings
- Making sure that parents participate actively in the Head Start planning process throughout the year
- Completing a "family needs assessment" for each Head Start family at the beginning of the year
- Giving parents an AP application form during Head Start enrollment and educating them about selecting child care

Positive Outcomes

- Each agency has learned the systems and services of the other agencies.
- Families are receiving the extended-day, early childhood services they need.
- The state collaboration people are identifying issues to be solved cooperatively.
- Local collaboratives are moving toward becoming flexible and creative.
- A genuine desire exists on the part of local agencies to "come to the table" and reduce turf issues. They are beginning to bridge the gap regarding perceptions and misinformation between State Preschool program staff and Head Start staff.
- School districts and State Preschool programs have benefited greatly from Head Start expansion start-up funding, acquiring playground, classroom, and office equipment that they otherwise could not afford at sites where space is shared.

Respondent:

Placer Community Action Council, Inc.
1166 High Street
Auburn, CA 95603
(530) 885-0432

Contact: **Dolores Garcia, Executive Director**

The Placer Community Action Council is a nonprofit organization providing Head Start services in Placer and Nevada counties. Both counties are largely rural, isolated, and mountainous and are experiencing a rapid growth in population.

Partnership Type, Services, and Funding

An additional 30 children are being served at two expansion sites offering a year-round program. Eight new staff were hired, including teachers, aides, and two family advocates.

The model blended funding with State Preschool/Western Placer School District and the Placer County Office of Education Children's Services. The State Preschool program offers three hours of service every morning, 175 days per year. Head Start provides four hours of services in the afternoon and hot meals for the children. The program is housed in existing licensed facilities at the school and Head Start sites.

Head Start awards $95,000 in expansion funds to provide an additional two hours of services a day, enriched staffing, and roughly two months of services to children in the State Preschool programs. State Preschool provides 175 days (three hours per day) of services to the children. Head Start regular funding provides four hours of services per day, year-round.

Successful Strategies for Establishing Partnerships and Overcoming Barriers

First, a partnership must have an established purpose. A strategic plan that includes goals and

objectives must then be developed to bring the partnership together.

In Placer and Nevada counties, successful strategies included partnering with State Preschool programs that provide the educational component while looking to Head Start for the provision of support services. The agencies worked together as a team to fill gaps and solve problems.

Sources of Support Utilized in the Collaborative Process

The State Preschool programs were utilized because their staff members were open to designing this program and committed to "making it work."

Barriers and Policy Issues

The first priority is to address the discrepancies between the state and federal income guidelines. The income guidelines must be waived in order to accomplish this model.

Broad, Unresolved Issues

The program mentioned income guidelines as an unresolved issue.

Strategies Used to Gain Feedback from Parents

The program staff first completed a needs assessment that included a parent questionnaire. The information gathered formed the basis for compiling feedback from the target groups. Finally, the Parent Policy Council screened and selected targeted sites for expansion.

Positive Outcomes

Nine free hours of child care are offered year-round to 30 families in two communities. State Preschool provides educational services and Head Start provides all family and health support services under the federal performance standards. This has created an opportunity for parents to work all day, all year long, without worrying about whether to quit or find other care, as many did prior to the expansion.

Respondent:

Contra Costa Head Start
2425 Bisso Lane, Suite 120
Concord, CA 94520
(925) 646-5548

Contact: **Pat Stroh, Director**

Contra Costa Head Start, a Community Action Agency, provides home-based and center-based services to almost 1,500 children in Contra Costa County. Contra Costa is a fast-growing and diverse county, ranging from the largely urban and industrialized west portion to the rapidly growing suburban communities in the east.

Partnership Type, Services, and Funding

An additional 180 children are being served at 17 expansion sites, five of which offer a center-based, 12-month option; the others offer a 12-months-per-year schedule in family child care homes. New staff hired for the expansion include five aides, five teachers, and two education supervisors.

Head Start, which is administered by the Contra Costa County Community Services Department, established a collaborative with the state Department of Education's Child Development Division, which has a contract to provide State Preschool and is also administered by the Community Services Department.

By pairing with State Preschool classes, which are also part-day, Head Start has been able to expand services to full-day/full-year. The county's Department of Social Services is a third partner, providing for its clients vouchers that can be used in the child care programs. Social Services also provides monetary support, when necessary, to help cover costs related to providing extended-day and extended-year services.

Dollar amounts were not specified on the survey form. State Preschool, Family Child Care Network, Head Start, and the Department of Social Services provide funding and services.

Successful Strategies for Establishing Partnerships and Overcoming Barriers

The Community Services Department did a great deal of preliminary work with the management staff of both partner agencies. The work included a series of meetings held to unify and streamline the efforts, help overcome initial mistrust and suspicion, and establish a pattern of working together. A decision to upgrade all child development sites to the quality standards of the Head Start program was also helpful. After several months of integration, both divisions assigned strong administrators to work together to deal with conflicts and problems as they arose. The administrators have acted as team members with all staff.

Sources of Support Utilized in the Collaborative Process

- Directors and managers of the Child Development and Head Start divisions
- Department of Social Services

Barriers and Policy Issues

- *Facilities.* Not enough facilities can be licensed to continue the expansion easily. Facilities can be built, but it is a time-consuming process. Land is also often difficult to find.
- *Training.* Head Start places a great deal of emphasis on training, and with staff working new and longer hours, it is difficult to schedule training time for all staff.
- *Personnel issues.* A shortage of qualified applicants, the territorial outlook of many staff members, major changes in the work hours and year, and supervision issues for two divisions represent collaboration barriers.
- *Fiscal issues:*
  - Head Start funding is higher than the state's rate for providers.
  - Head Start classrooms are maintained and furnished in a far more expensive manner than those funded by the state. For example, Head Start classrooms have money to paint, buy computers, and send staff to new curriculum training.
  - Documenting the various funding streams and allocating costs correctly are extremely complicated.

Broad, Unresolved Issues

- The majority of Head Start salaries are higher than the salaries in state programs.
- State Preschool complies with Title V regulations, while Head Start falls under Title XXII regulations.
- State Preschool has aligned its job titles and descriptions with the state matrix, while Head Start has not.
- The programs are still trying to develop standard forms for both divisions that will include information needed by both the federal and state governments.
- Differences in income-level requirements represent a major unresolved issue.

Strategies Used to Gain Feedback from Parents

- Parent meetings
- Contacts made by Head Start family service workers
- Annual community needs assessments

Positive Outcomes

- Head Start has been able to provide full-day/full-year programs to many more children. Parents do not want or need part-time services anymore. And with the TANF requirements, many parents are unable to use part-time services.
- Our staff members now have full-time jobs. In the past, staff members were laid off during the summer months and rehired in the fall. Their benefits ceased and they had no insurance coverage during the summer months.
- Both programs have been enriched by the partnership.
- Other partnerships have also occurred. Head Start has contracted with two preschools to provide services to eligible

children. Social Service vouchers cover the monthly tuition for the children, and Head Start supplements with required Head Start services. Head Start has also provided some start-up funds to enrich the classroom to meet Head Start standards.

Respondent:

Los Angeles County Office of Education Head Start–State Preschool Division 17315 Studebaker Road Cerritos, CA 90703-2553 (562) 940-1770

Contact: **Andrew Kennedy, Division Director**

The Los Angeles County Office of Education's Head Start–State Preschool Division currently provides Early Head Start and regular Head Start services, center-based and home-based, to approximately 22,000 children and their families in Los Angeles County. The most heavily populated metropolitan area in the county is mostly urban, with a high density of poor families that represent a multitude of cultural backgrounds.

Partnership Types, Services, and Funding

An additional 2,099 children and their families are expected to be served at eight expansion sites offering a 12-month, full-day service program. It is expected that 75 staff members will be added because of the expansion. Included will be 20 aides, 30 teachers, 15 specialists, and 10 others in unspecified positions.

The program partners with child care programs to reduce the cost of providing child care services to families affected by welfare reform, which will bring about an increase in the number of children eligible for Head Start-child care services. Because the populations of families eligible for child development services and Head Start services often overlap, the program believes it is fitting to work together to ensure that quality, affordable services are provided.

The proposed models include the following:

- *Blending programs and splitting costs.* This model would bring Head Start staff and funds together with the Department of Social Services (to access Child Care Block Grant funding) and Alternative Payment programs to provide full-day/full-year services.
- *Connecting programs through a shared wraparound model.* This model would work with existing full-day child care programs and "dropping-in" Head Start activities to supplement program activities. Provision of the children's educational experiences would be shared by Head Start and the child care provider's staff at the provider's child care site.
- *Matched services.* This model would allow Head Start to match services with State Preschool. In the state programs, preschool services are offered to income-eligible families four hours per day, five days per week.
- *Family Child Care Homes.* This model would allow licensed family child care home providers an opportunity to offer Head Start services in their home. All family child care providers offering services through LACOE or one of its delegate agencies would participate in Head Start-specific training and education activities.

The Los Angeles County Office of Education's Head Start program hopes to forge partnerships that will lead to the use of funding from State Preschool, state General Child Care, the Family Child Care Network, and AP programs as well as from Head Start itself.

Successful Strategies for Establishing Partnerships and Overcoming Barriers

The program sent out numerous interest surveys across the county. After completing the survey, participants were invited to a series of orientation and interest meetings. After a critical

mass was identified, an introductory meeting was held to bring delegate agency staff together with potential collaborators. At that point, one-on-one meetings were held between current delegate agency directors and child care providers' administrators to develop business plans describing the ways in which the collaboration would be carried out.

Sources of Support Utilized in the Collaborative Process

The interagency coordinating council for child care has been a solid linkage for bridging Head Start's relationships. Many of the local partnerships were first forged through discussions at the council meetings; knowledge and trust were built through those experiences.

Barriers and Policy Issues

The children in Head Start are also served by school district prekindergarten classes (part-day program), State Preschool (part-day program), and state child development centers (full-day program). With the implementation of welfare reform, a high percentage of former AFDC recipients require both employment and child care. The number of child care providers is insufficient; therefore, partners are not available in some areas. Head Start has had to cultivate many available local partners as well as create partners in child care.

One of the major problems facing Head Start expansion efforts is the lack of available facilities. Although increases in funding have been allocated, outfitting new classrooms and hiring new staff would consume most of the increased funding.

Other issues that have emerged and been addressed include the following:

- Insurance coverage and liability
- Staffing patterns
- Costs—those to be shared and those not to be shared
- Benefits of and barriers to participation
- Administrative overlap and responsibility
- Merging different funding streams

Broad, Unresolved Issues

- Training of new family child care providers
- Facilities that meet licensing requirements
- Liability concerns regarding contracting with private child care and family child care home providers
- Development of new contracts for all program models
- Quick internal approval of contracts

Challenges include:

- Identifying space for providing full-day services
- Identifying Head Start-eligible children whose parents will be affected by CalWorks and who will need full-day care
- Identifying Head Start-eligible children who will remain eligible after their parents become employed
- Identifying child care providers who serve Head Start-eligible children
- Establishing MOUs that would allow Head Start to partner with state-funded and other subsidized programs
- Identifying the conflicting regulations and operating procedures of various funding sources

Strategies Used to Gain Feedback from Parents

- Presentation to the Policy Council Research and Evaluation Committee
- Survey of parents who were being served by the delegate agencies to determine full-day child care needs

Positive Outcomes

In many areas of Los Angeles County, Head Start is serving less than 10 percent of the eligible population. These areas have a high percentage of families living in poverty, high numbers of AFDC recipients, high unemployment rates, and limited (in some cases, nonexistent) child care. Several areas have no viable child care partnership opportunities. In these areas of highest need, Head Start proposes to expand its services up to 40 percent and, at the same time,

pursue child care partners. By establishing partnerships with the child care community, programs will be able to do the following:

- Deliver comprehensive services to a greater number of children and families.
- Expand linkages among Head Start and public and private entities.
- Create partnerships with Head Start and child care providers.
- Enhance the child care infrastructure by improving child care facilities and environments, expanding staff development opportunities, and increasing wages and benefits for child care workers.
- Avoid the challenge of finding new space while reducing start-up costs.
- Provide more flexible hours of service.

Respondent:

Santa Clara County Office of Education
Children's Services Department, Head Start
1290 Ridder Park Drive
San Jose, CA 95131-6894
(408) 453-6980

Contact: **Yolanda Garcia, Director**

The Santa Clara COE Head Start program provides center-based, regular Head Start services to approximately 2,500 children and their families in Santa Clara and San Benito counties. Santa Clara County is growing quickly and maintains a low unemployment rate because of a large number of high-tech and service jobs. It is also multicultural and has the third-largest immigrant population in the state. The county also contains five of the 200 poorest zip code areas in California. Poverty is well-documented in downtown and eastside San Jose. San Benito County is largely rural and agricultural, with some growing suburban areas.

Partnership Types, Services, and Funding

An additional 120 children are being served at six expansion sites offering a 12-month program. New staff hired for the expansion include nine teachers, nineteen teaching assistants, one accountant, one custodian, and one food-service delivery worker. The expansion has added six classrooms to the Head Start program.

Santa Clara COE Head Start and the Center for Employment Training (CET) formed a partnership in 1997. Parents receive all Head Start family support services plus the employment training offered by CET. All classrooms are located on CET sites and have been renovated by means of the federal funds provided by the expansion grant. Parents receive child care support throughout their training, job search, and beginning employment phases. Child care and family support services continue for both child and parents until the child's transition to kindergarten.

Through the expansion, parent education, child development, and family support services were provided at $6,337 per child. Head Start funds provided 50 percent of the services, a total of $1,115,975.

Successful Strategies for Establishing Partnerships and Overcoming Barriers

- Offering employment opportunities to the staff of both agencies
- Utilizing existing facilities and remodeling them to meet program requirements
- Creating an extended timeline for the merger to allow an adjustment period for staff, families, and children (The merger began in January and extended through August.)
- Building a "grandfathering process" into the policies; that is, accepting currently enrolled children and families, including private-pay families

Sources of Support Utilized in the Collaborative Process

- The CET's training program for ECE students provided support and supplemental staff in the classrooms.
- Ombudsman Jim Hopper, from the Licensing Office, gave outstanding assistance to both agencies.
- Head Start in-house support staff—maintenance, warehouse, clerical, and enrollment personnel—created a critical link in accomplishing the expansion.
- The knowledge and expertise of the Head Start management staff offered guidance to both partners.
- Management personnel in both programs have participated in the Santa Clara Local Child Care Planning Council with many other child care providers. Lessons learned from experiences with Social Services, licensing, the 4 C's R&R, and other colleagues assisted both programs in completing the partnership arrangements.

Barriers and Policy Issues

- Meeting licensing requirements
- Helping the Social Services Department understand the collaborative arrangements
- Blending the staff of both agencies
- Understanding the different reporting mechanisms for more than one funding stream
- Designing new forms for parents
- Coordinating different timelines and calendars

Issues dealt with as a part of the collaboration:

- Curriculum blending of Montessori and High/Scope to create an eclectic approach
- Governing board support from both agencies
- Communication links at many levels: federal, state, social services agency, governing board, teaching staff, and support staff
- Combined training for teaching staff to understand the policies and procedures of both agencies

Broad, Unresolved Issues

- Understanding of multiple funding streams and how they apply to individual children and families
- Understanding by parents, staff, and other community agencies of the collaborative process and agreements
- Incomplete licensing process through the Department of Social Services
- Combining both programs' literature: handbooks, brochures, advertising, and personnel policies

Strategies Used to Gain Feedback from Parents

- Head Start parents have participated in an annual program planning day each spring. Expansion of full-day options has been a recommendation for the past three years.
- Colocated programs prior to the expansion elicited much curiosity and interest from CET parents.
- Parent meetings at the CET sites, with both management teams in attendance, gave CET parents an opportunity to ask questions about and become familiar with Head Start program plans.

Positive outcomes

- Parents receive seamless delivery of services and support as they transition from welfare to work.
- Children receive full-day/full-year child care in a stable, safe environment.
- Continuity for children and parents is maintained.
- The developmentally appropriate educational program ensures that the children will make a successful transition to public school.

Respondent:

County of San Joaquin Head Start Child Development Council, Inc. 2451 Country Club Boulevard Stockton, CA 95204 (209) 466-5541

Contact: **Marci Massei, Executive Director**

The County of San Joaquin Head Start Child Development Council provides Early Head Start, regular Head Start, and migrant Head Start center- and home-based services to more than 3,000 children and their families in San Joaquin County. The service area is growing quickly and features suburban and urban areas interspersed with farmlands.

Partnership Types, Services, and Funding

An additional 817 children will be served at ten expansion sites in Stockton, Manteca, and Lodi. New staff hired (or in process of being hired at the time of the survey) include 14 aides, 14 teachers, 3 specialists, and 10 social services and/or mental health workers.

The three models that were developed for the expansion are described as follows:

- *Head Start extended-day, wraparound, three-hour State Preschool program.* All children receive full Head Start services. During the summer Head Start will provide for services that include child care while State Preschool is closed.
- *Head Start extended-day paired with state child care extended-day for a full-year, full-week program.* All children and families receive full Head Start services.
- *State child care providing full-day/full-year child care.* Head Start provides only support services—health, parent education, special education advocacy, social, and mental health services.

State Preschool programs provide part-day services; state General Child Care provides half of a full-day program, and Head Start provides all support services to each child and family.

Successful Strategies for Establishing Partnerships and Overcoming Barriers

- The agency reported that local partners must have a common vision and goals and place their commitment to service to their community over their commitment to their agency or funding source.
- Partners must be persistent, optimistic, and have a commitment to collaborating and working through barriers.

Sources of Support Utilized in the Collaborative Process

Vision and leadership of several key local child care staff, including the coordinator for County Child Care and the director of School-Age Parent Individual Development (SAPID), were the key sources of support.

Barriers and Policy Issues

- In regard to expansion of state-funded preschool and child development programs, the grantee experienced a reluctance to address differences in regulations, with the exception of the lower income eligibility of Head Start.
- Local partners feel that they do not have the authority to negotiate and that they must have Head Start follow state regulations.
- The grantee believes that a need exists for the Child Development Division to adopt an MOU with the Department of Health and Human Services to ensure collaborative processes that enable children in need to be served in quality programs.
- Policy issues that emerged and were dealt with in the collaborative efforts included eligibility, attendance, curriculum, discipline, communication, role of parents, class size, and staffing.

Broad, Unresolved Issues

The grantee reported that the state and federal agencies should agree on the need to allow agencies flexibility to best meet the needs of children and families, contingent on their meeting state and federal eligibility and quality program requirements. The issues are numerous; for example, why does CDD expect a class size of 24 children, when the class size for kindergarten through third grade is being reduced to 20? Other unresolved issues are related to attendance, frequency of verifying income and other conditions of eligibility, and length of the State Preschool day and year.

Strategies Used to Gain Feedback from Parents

- Surveys
- Forums to respond to new information and data collection
- "Visioning" (planning) retreats

Positive Outcomes

More children are receiving needed services, including full-day educational programming and child care.

Respondents:

HRC, Inc.–Calaveras Head Start/ State Preschool
P.O. Box 1225
Valley Springs, CA 95252
(209) 772-3984

Contact: **Janet Orvis Cook, Program Director**

Calaveras Head Start is a private, nonprofit agency that provides regular Head Start center-based services to 246 children and their families in Calaveras County. Calaveras is the sixth-fastest growing county in the state, yet it remains largely rural and isolated.

Partnership Types, Services, and Funding

An additional 30 children are being served in a full-day/full-year program. New staff hired for the expansion include two aides, two teachers, and one child development mentor.

Two models were created for the expansion:

- *Center-based: wraparound services.* This model wraps State Preschool around Head Start to provide a total of 12 hours per day of child care and education, year-round.
- *Family child care home: wrap-in services.* In this model, the Head Start mentor provides to FCCHs a full range of program services subsidized by the AP program.

For the center-based option, 48 percent of the expansion funds ($196,124) was from Head Start and 52 percent ($209,226) was from State Preschool extended-day funds. The funds provided four extra hours per day of services and two additional months during the summer.

For the family day care option, ten children are funded with $60,000 of Head Start expansion funds. The AP program provides funding for day care for these children at an unknown amount.

Successful Strategies for Establishing Partnerships and Overcoming Barriers

- Relationship building
- Focus on a common goal
- Creativity
- Flexibility
- "[When you] have both contracts [Head Start and State Preschool], you wrap around yourself!"

Sources of Support Utilized in the Collaborative Process

- The Region IX administrator encouraged the collaborators to "go for it" although there are no guidelines.
- The support of the Day Care Providers Association was vital to the collaboration.

Barriers and Policy Issues

- Support and information are lacking from both Head Start and SDE/CDD, especially from the Collaboration Project.
- Differing income requirements, regulations, and other requirements exist between Head Start and CDE/CDD.
- Our program meets the most restrictive policy of funding sources. For example, all teaching staff meet Title V regulations/ matrix, which are the most restrictive of the requirements.

Broad, Unresolved Issues

- Discrepant regulations.
- Income guidelines—Head Start's limit is too low, especially as more families go to work or school.
- Need for written guidelines, a consistent message—It depends on who you talk to as to what is allowable.
- Positive attitude—We need to find a way to make collaboration happen, not find ways that it doesn't work.

Strategies Used to Gain Feedback from Parents

Just ask them what they need, but also make note of:

- Community assessment
- Family assessment
- Focus groups and surveys
- R&R data

Positive Outcomes

- Families have more options for care and education.
- Quality is enhanced.
- FCCH providers are supported and less isolated, improving recruitment and retainment efforts.
- Resources are shared and therefore maximized.

Respondent:

Northern California Child Development, Inc.
P.O. Box 529
Los Molinos, CA 96055
(530) 384-7922

Contact: **Kathy McGuinness, Executive Director**

Northern California Child Development, a private, nonprofit organization, provides regular Head Start services in home- and center-based settings to 210 children and their families in Tehama County. Tehama County is largely rural, with isolated pockets of low-income families.

Partnership Types, Services, and Funding

An additional 34 children and their families are now being served at one new expansion site, which offers a full-year program. New staff hired for the expansion include three aides, three teachers, one family advocate, one bus driver, and one food service worker.

Head Start is to be located within the Community Employment Center. Tehama Employment Network members include JTPA, EDD, CalWORKS, and Head Start. This multiagency, collaborative effort is designed to support economic development through workforce development, job training, welfare reform efforts, school-to-career services, and full-day/full-year Head Start services.

Additional funding was provided by the AP fund, community program funds, and other sources.

Successful Strategies for Establishing Partnerships and Overcoming Barriers

- Pre-project discussions and development of a common mission statement
- Working together over a long period of time on a variety of projects
- Agreement from each agency to an MOU on each member's funding proposals

Sources of Support Utilized in the Collaborative Process

- Consultation with other Head Start directors
- Meetings with collaboration participants

Barriers and Policy Issues

The greatest hurdle has been facility renovation and development. Funding source restrictions have caused a considerable delay. The Tehama County Administrator will now take the lead in facility development.

Other broad issues that were addressed included:

- Time limitations on funding
- Variance in work space costs and sizes allowed by the different agencies
- Computer networks
- Allocation of costs
- Development of the agencies' spaces and their cost differential (e.g., child care center and conference rooms)

Broad, Unresolved Issues

The issue of ongoing funding in a full-year Head Start model with clients whose child care reimbursement is time-limited remains unresolved.

Strategies Used to Gain Feedback from Parents

- Family strengths and needs assessment
- Enrollment recruitment noting child care needs
- Local child care planning council survey
- Head Start Policy Council and committee activities

Positive Outcomes

- Better service to mutual customers is accomplished through an integrated system of service delivery, operated either within one colocated center or via electronic connectivity.
- Needed services are available.
- All Head Start-eligible children in the county have an opportunity to be enrolled at the expansion site.

Respondent:

Sacramento Employment and Training Agency Head Start
3750 Rosin Court, Suite 100
Sacramento, CA 95834
(916) 263-3722

Contact: **Deborah Paratore, Manager, Special Projects**

SETA, a multipurpose community action agency, provides home- and center-based services to 4,800 children, ages infancy through five years, and their families in Sacramento County. The service area is suburban, with rural and urban pockets. Sacramento is the sixth-largest city in California and is the fastest-growing urban area in the state. The population is culturally diverse; significant changes in the ethnic make-up of the community have been fed by dramatic increases in immigration and secondary migration patterns of refugees. Local agencies are currently experiencing a high demand for Hmong-, Ukranian-, and Spanish-speaking staff.

Partnership Types, Services, and Funding

Three models have been established as follows:

- *SETA Head Start/North Sacramento School District State Preschool collaboration.* Each of forty preschoolers receives five hours per day of Head Start services and three hours per day of State Preschool (part-year) services at Head Start. SETA Head Start provides child care during the summer months to provide full-day/full-year services.
- *SETA Head Start/SETA state-funded child care collaboration.* Each of forty preschoolers receives Head Start services for three and one-half hours per day, five days per week, for 34 weeks. Through a federal HUD contract, state child care funds provide an additional seven and one-half hours per day and child care 11 hours per day for an additional 18 weeks during the

summer to provide full-day/full-year services to eligible children of working parents. In addition, toddlers ages 18 months to three years receive full-day/full-year services at the site, and school-age children up to age nine receive before-and-after school care and full-day, off-track care.

- *SETA Head Start Child Care Collaboration Project.* Head Start provides education, health, nutritional, special education, mental health, and parent involvement services to 188 eligible children (and their families) enrolled in full-day/full-year care through child care centers, homes, preschools, or exempt providers. Child care services are funded through AP program or CDSS and/or CDD voucher payments to providers. Providers receive comprehensive services, staff support, training allowances, materials, and training from Head Start. Families receive training, home-based services, and access to Head Start events and materials.

A total of 268 children are served at two expansion sites offering a 12-month program and through 42 providers who offer full-day/full-year child care. In the State Preschool program, no staff were hired by either partner agency; services were extended simply by pairing programs. SETA Head Start's state child care-funded program has added two child care teachers and two child care teacher aides. In the community-based child care collaboration, one education coordinator, eight home visitors, and five education specialists have been added.

The child care collaboration project is a very promising model; however, it has been in operation for only one year and needs to be evaluated in terms of the children's outcomes and the benefits to providers and to the community in general.

Partners	Services provided	Source of funds
State Preschool—North Sacramento School District	3 hours of preschool services, 5 days per week, 146 days per year	CDE/CDD
State General Child Care	8 hours of child care, after-school care, and infant/toddler care for 9 months; 11 hours of care during summer months	CDE/CDD
Private providers	Full-day/full-year child care services	AP, Stage I, II, III, or private pay

Successful Strategies for Establishing Partnerships and Overcoming Barriers

- Spend the time necessary to build trust and relationships and create a strong vision that supports mutual goals.
- Recognize and celebrate the reaching of milestones as a group.
- Set regular times for staff and administrators to meet to review progress, share information, and resolve issues.
- Identify strengths and influential networks of partner(s) to utilize in building and enhancing collaboration efforts.
- Put it in writing—especially roles and responsibilities, calendars, and agreements.
- Be an advocate for your partner(s) with their funding entities, regulators, and so forth.

Sources of Support Utilized in the Collaborative Process

- Current management and program service staff who have knowledge and experience in collaboration, program design and planning, and community building
- Local R&R and Local Child Care Planning Council
- Board of Supervisors, City Council, and other elected governing bodies or individuals
- Other California Head Start agencies

Barriers and Policy Issues

The barriers and other issues are somewhat different for each model:

Head Start/State Preschool wraparound:

- Different eligibility requirements, curriculum, policies, and procedures
- Different school years, holidays, and in-service days
- Adult–child ratio
- Differences in staff prep time and training days
- Need for augmented traditional funding to provide summer enrichment

SETA Head Start/SETA state-funded child care collaboration:

- Difficulty in providing training to child care staff because of mandated days of service
- Salary differences (Head Start teachers are part-year/higher pay as opposed to full-year/lower pay of child care teachers, creating an unnecessary "class system.")

The Child Care Collaboration Project (CCCP):

- New program model requires lengthier start-up
- Educating/marketing benefits of program
- Meshing partners' philosophy; creating a common language
- Sharing of confidential information
- Development of staff training on a pioneering model
- Addressing quality vs. flexibility issues with different types of providers
- Development of evaluation tools

Broad, Unresolved Issues

Issues that continue to restrain collaboration include differences in enrollment and eligibility, Title V vs. Title XXII, funding levels (funding per child too low under the state), forms (clear need for integration of universal forms), and program objectives and philosophy. A particular perplexity in meeting the goals of expansion—to provide full-day/full-year services to new children and families—is how to utilize or convert existing part-day slots to meet the changing needs of families who are in transition to work.

Strategies Used to Gain Feedback from Parents

Feedback has been gained through the Family and Community Partnership Committee, the Policy Council and Parent Advisory Committee meetings, parent planning and leadership retreats and training, parent surveys, home visits, Parent Site Council meetings, Social Services Advisory Committee meetings, and information from male involvement representatives, parent resource assistants, and family service workers.

Positive Outcomes

Opportunities to expand collaborations have emerged as a result of building relationships. A Providers' Network has been developed, and further collaboration with partners, such as the addition of child care dollars by our State Preschool partner, has been explored. Stepping outside of traditional service boundaries spreads an awareness of the high quality and comprehensiveness of Head Start services to a broader audience. In developing new working relationships, opportunities emerge to learn and teach with partners. Producing successful programs creates synergy among partners that gets directed toward improving and expanding early childhood development services.

Other positive outcomes differ, depending on the model:

Head Start/State Preschool wraparound:

- Meets Head Start's goal of expanding full-day/full-year services
- Addresses the shortage of qualified child development personnel
- Helps meet the needs of CalWorks families who are returning to work
- Provides opportunities to expand collaborative efforts

SETA Head Start/SETA state-funded child care collaboration:

- Meets Head Start's goal of expanding full-day/full-year services
- Helps meet the needs of CalWorks families who are returning to work
- Serves all siblings in the family at one site
- Provides seamless preschool and childcare services

The Child Care Collaboration Project (CCCP):

- Meets Head Start's goal of expanding full-day/full-year services
- Allows Head Start access for children and families utilizing family child care homes, centers, and exempt providers
- Addresses lack of available facilities
- Addresses the shortage of qualified child development personnel
- Helps meet the needs of CalWorks families who are returning to work
- Can provide services anywhere a provider exists
- Enhances the level of child development services for all children cared for by a provider
- Keeps child care dollars in the community
- Raises the level of child development services throughout the county
- Reduces bureaucracy for families
- Honors parents' choice
- Provides greater potential for working with providers who care for non-preschool-age siblings

Appendix B

California Head Start and Collaborative Partnerships Survey

Agency name _____

_____

Mailing address _____

_____

Contact person _____

Telephone _____ FAX _____

Title _____ E-mail address _____

A. Program information: Each grantee will complete this survey describing all expansion collaborative partnerships.

Type of grantee (check all that apply):

_____ Single purpose
_____ Multipurpose
_____ Nonprofit
_____ County Office of Education
_____ School District
_____ Community Action Organization
_____ Other (please be specific)
_____ Total number of children served

Type of program (check all that apply):

_____ Early Head Start
_____ Regular Head Start
_____ Migrant Head Start
_____ Native American Head Start
_____ Home-based
_____ Center-based
_____ Family Child Care Network
_____ Total children added due to collaboration activities

_____ Total number of additional staff hired to implement expansion collaborative partnerships

_____ Aide
_____ Teacher
_____ Specialist
_____ Other (please be specific)

B. Number of expansion sites offering:

_____ 12-month option

_____ 10-month option (from _____ to _____)

_____ Other option (please be specific: number of months/program year _____)

C. Geographic information:

Service Areas:

1. County(s) Served

   Type:

   _____ Rural

   _____ Suburban

   _____ Urban

2. Special characteristics: (isolated areas, fast growing etc.)

D. Description of Collaborative Partnerships:

1. Describe your expansion collaborative partnership(s) including services:

2. Describe the positive elements/outcomes from these partnerships(s):

3. Identify issues/barriers experienced while creating the collaborative partnership(s):

4. Identify successful strategies used to establish collaborative partnerships and overcome existing barriers:

5. Explain other broad policy issues that emerged and were addressed as part of collaborative and expansion efforts:

6. Identify any broad issues that are still unresolved (state or local):

7. Identify the greatest sources of support and information you have utilized as part of collaborative and expansion efforts:

8. List strategies used to gain input from Head Start parents as well as parents in the targeted expansion population:

9. Please add any additional information about your expansion partnership(s) that you think may be helpful. For example, discuss other collaborative partners that are not providing a direct service.

10. Complete the chart below to summarize your partnership:

Direct Services Partners Check all that apply.	**Services Provided**	*Source of funds (e.g., Head Start, funded by CDE/CDD, private child care providers, etc.) and* Percent of total allocated for each element?	
		$	%
❑ State Preschool			
❑ State General Child Care			
❑ Center-based			
❑ Family Child Care Network			
❑ Alternative Payment			
❑ Community programs			
❑ Other			

Any additional comments:

99-009 902-2114-156 11-99 2,500

ISBN 0-8011-1491-8

BEST COPY AVAILABLE